

**REMARKS**

Claims 11, 15, 16, 19, 21, 22, 26 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Fontana reference in view of the Wright et al reference; and claims 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Fontana and Wright et al references in further view of the Stinson reference. Claims 11, 26 and 34 are independent claims. Applicant has further amended claims 11 and 26 and has cancelled claim 34.

Applicant desires to acknowledge and express appreciation for the courtesies extended during the recent telephone interview with Examiner Mark Milia on December 11, 2007 regarding the subject case. The Examiner was advised as to further amendments Applicant proposed to make to independent claims 11 and 26 to even more clearly distinguish such claims over the cited prior art. Although no affirmative agreement was reached with the Examiner during the telephone interview, the Examiner did indicate that the addition of the amended claim language set forth above to independent claims 11 and 26 appeared to distinguish Applicant's invention over the cited Fontana and Wright et al references.

Applicant herein incorporates by reference all of the arguments set forth in Applicant's previous responses filed in the subject case received by the USPTO on February 1 and June 28, 2007. As discussed with the Examiner in the telephone interview, Fig. 5 of the Wright et al reference sets forth the entire mattress label system disclosed therein. More particularly, a user of the Wright et al system must enter a known SKU number for the particular product of interest and once that SKU number has been entered, the database brings up the description to be printed for that particular SKU number. Nothing else is displayed, selected, and/or verified in the Wright et al system before printing. Although Fig. 5 of the Wright et al reference does indicate

that the database displays a summary of the order with a total quantity of labels needed, and that the user can edit this order on the screen prior to printing, there is no disclosure in the Wright et al reference, or the Fontana reference, which allows the user to view the selected specific product information on the selected fabric label prior to printing. This feature has been added to both independent claims 11 and 26 in the present application, and this feature is explained in paragraph 47 of the present application as well as in Fig. 4b at step 122. No new matter has been added. Clearly, there is no suggestion, motivation, or disclosure in either the Wright et al or Fontana references which enables a user to view the selected product information for printing on the selected fabric label prior to printing. This feature, in and of itself, patentably distinguishes independent claims 11 and 26 over the cited prior art, including the Wright et al, Fontana, and Stinson et al references, either alone or in any combination.

In addition, with respect to the Fontana reference, the Examiner has already indicated in prior Office Actions that the Fontana reference does not disclose selecting any type of information for printing onto a label from any type of a computer database. For this reason alone, the further limitations of independent claims 11 and 26 distinguish Applicant's invention over the Fontana reference.

With respect to independent claim 26, Applicant has likewise added the additional step of selecting the correct format of the selected mattress fabric label that correlates with the selected specific mattress information. See, Fig. 4b, Step 124. This step enables the user to make sure that the specific product information comports with the selected fabric label in the space available for printing the selected product information. Here again, this format correction is not disclosed, taught or even suggested in any of the cited prior art references including the Wright et al, Fontana and Stinson et al references. There is no disclosure or reference in Fig. 5 of the

Wright et al reference which indicates this correlation. The Wright et al system only allows a user to review a summary of the order and edit such order prior to printing. There is no disclosure or reference with respect to selecting any type of format for correlation with the selected product information. For this reason alone, independent claim 26 is likewise clearly and patentably distinguishable over both the Fontana and Wright et al references, either alone or in any combination.

Still further, claim 26 also further includes the step of verifying the selected specific mattress information prior to printing. Here again, no verification step is disclosed in any of the cited prior art references including the Wright et al, Fontana and Stinson et al references.

Applicant likewise incorporates herein by reference the law on obviousness set forth in Applicant's previous response received February 1, 2007 on pages 21-25 of such response. Again, the combination of combining the Fontana and Wright et al references does not yield a process for creating and printing a fabric label as now recited in independent claims 11 and 26. It is the combination of the specific computer data features defined in the present independent claims along with the ability to create and print the specific product or mattress information directly onto a specific product or mattress fabric label that is unique and novel with respect to the present process.

For all of the reasons set forth above, it is Applicant's position that the Fontana and Wright et al references, either alone or in any combination, do not disclose the computer database features as defined in all of the presently pending independent claims in the present application for the specific applications defined therein nor do such references provide the necessary suggestion and/or motivation for creating and printing fabric labels as specifically defined and claimed in the presently pending claims. As a result, it would not have been obvious

Application of: Thayer A. Coburn  
Serial No.: 10/707,616  
Amendment C

to a person skilled in the art to combine Wright and Fontana to obtain the invention as claimed in independent claims 11 and 26.

It is now believed that all of the claims in the present application, namely, claims 11, 15-19, 21, 22 and 26 contain limitations and restrictions which patentably distinguish them over the cited prior art including the Fontana and Wright et al references. None of the cited references, either alone or in any combination thereof, disclose or suggest all of the novel features associated with the present process, nor do the prior art constructions provide the specific advantages and objectives obtained by the present process. Favorable action and allowance of the claims is therefore respectfully requested.

If any issue regarding the allowability of any of the pending claims in the present application could be readily resolved, or if other action could be taken to further advance this application such as an Examiner's amendment, or if the Examiner should have any questions regarding the present amendment, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner please telephone Applicant's undersigned attorney in this regard.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 14 DEC 07

  
Samuel Digirolamo  
Reg. No. 29,915  
Blackwell Sanders LLP  
720 Olive Street, Suite 2400  
St. Louis, MO 63101  
314-345-6000  
ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT